

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1, 3-12 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant is amending claim 1 and cancelling claim 9. As a result, claims 1, 3-8, 10-12 are pending for examination with claim 1 being an independent claim. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kozlowski (U.S. 6,218,796). Claims 1 and 3-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara et al. (U.S. 5,746,282) in view of Kozlowski. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Kozlowski and further in view of Andes (U.S. 6,443,252). Claims 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Kozlowski and further in view of Salmon (DE 100 10 852). Applicant has cancelled claim 9 and amended independent claim 1 by incorporating the features of original claim 9 to more clearly distinguish over the cited reference. However, as noted, claim 9, which depended from claim 1, was also rejected. The Applicants traverse this rejection.

In rejecting claim 9, the Office Action recognizes that Fujiwara in view of Kozlowski discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention as described except for a docking rail. The Office Action then refers to Salmon as allegedly teaching this limitation and concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus shown by Fujiwara with the docking rail as taught by Salmon in order to provide the advantage of connecting more than one cart together for increased efficiency. The Examiner refers to FIG 10 of Salmon.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that claim 9 is obvious over Fujiwara in view of Kozlowski and Salmon. The Office Action has conceded that Fujiwara in view of Kozlowski fails to disclose a docking rail. It is respectfully submitted that Salmon does not teach a docking rail as now claimed because Salmon only shows a cart which is connectable to, for example, a standing device or another cart. Contrary to this, the docking rail, as now claimed in

claim 1, is arranged in the marginal region of the base, with the docking rail being constructed and arranged to be connectable to a charging rail for charging the accumulator. Support for this amendment may be found on page 3, paragraph 3 of the specification: The *docking rail* is fixed to a “... *charging rail fixedly arranged on a wall or the like in the parking station of the cleaning cart...*” to enable the charging of the accumulator. Since neither FIG 3 nor FIG 10 of Salmon shows a docking rail serving as an arrangement to charge the accumulator, claim 1, as now amended, is novel and non-obvious in view of the cited prior art.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as now amended, overcomes the rejection.

Claims 3-8, 10-12 depend from claim 1 and are thus all patentable in view of Fujiwara, Kozlowski, and Salmon for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that minor clarifying amendments to the claim would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to please charge our Deposit Account No. 23/2825 under Docket No. H0075.70115US00 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: June 16, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Neil Ferraro

Registration No.: 39,188

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

617.646.8000